DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 261 126 UD 024 426

AUTHOR Sacks, Susan Kiemer; Brady, Patricia
TITLE Who Teaches the City's Children? A Study of New York City First Year Teachers.
PUB DATE Apr 85
NOTE 28p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Chicago, IL, March 31-April 4, 1985).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Beginning Teachers; Elementary Secondary Education; Racial Differences; Sex Differences; *Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Characteristics; *Teacher Morale; Urban Schools
IDENTIFIERS *New York (New York)

ABSTRACT

In 1983, 602 first year New York City teachers participated in a questionnaire study of their backgrounds, motivations, personal attitudes and experiences, and the support structures they felt they needed to survive in their profession. Results indicate that regardless of gender, race, or religion, participants were proud to teach, well educated, concerned about children, fully engaged in their new profession, and relatively unstressed (although teachers of kindergarten through Grade 3, women, and Caucasians were slightly more stressed than other groups). Overall, first year teachers appear to be hard-working individuals who are motivated more by idealistic than pragmatic reasons for entering teaching. They also seem to be more concerned with their students' experiences than with their own experiences as new teachers, and this is an indication of the transition from self-preoccupation to pupil-centeredness that is necessary for effective teaching. However, the fact that there were so few differences among the 602 teachers of diverse backgrounds and experiences, from every grade level and city borough, suggests that the first teaching year may have a normalizing effect. The new teachers gave strong support for retired teachers to serve as mentors for first-year teachers in 1984, and a study of this intervention is underway. (KH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED261126

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Susan Riemer Sacks

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

WHO TEACHES THE CITY'S CHILDREN?

A STUDY OF NEW YORK CITY FIRST YEAR TEACHERS

Susan Riemer Sacks, Ph.D.
Barnard College
Columbia University

and

Patricia Brady
Teachers College
Columbia University

Paper presented at 1985 American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois, April 1985. Not to be reproduced without permission.

UD 024426

WHO TEACHES THE CITY'S CHILDREN?

A STUDY OF NEW YORK CITY FIRST YEAR TEACHERS

Susan Riemer Sacks, Ph.D.
Barnard College, Columbia Univ.

and

Patricia Brady
Teachers College, Columbia Univ.

In Spring 1983, 602 first year New York City teachers participated in a questionnaire study of their backgrounds, motivations, personal attitudes and experiences, and desired support structures. Results indicated that regardless of gender, race, or religion, participants were proud to teach, well educated, relatively unstressed, concerned about children, and fully engaged in their new profession. Data suggested that teachers of K-3, women, and Caucasians were slightly more stressed than other groups. Strong support was given for retired teachers to serve as mentors for new teachers in 1984, and a study of this intervention is underway.

WHO TEACHES THE CITY'S CHILDREN?[1]

In urban centers throughout the nation, and in New York City in particular, a major concern is attracting and retaining effective teachers. For the sake of the children this is a necessary concern for society as a whole and for educators especially. The issue of attracting bright college students to teaching has become the focus of numerous studies, among them Goodlad (1983), Sizer (1983) and Sykes (1983). New York City schools have needed teachers in the past several years, yet there has been a dearth of information about the new teachers themselves. What is known is that between 1981 and 1983, 779 teachers in their first teaching year quit, and of these, 569 (73%) left within the first five months of taking their assignment. A total of 203 (26%) resigned within the first month.[2] The present study was undertaken in Spring 1983 to gain information about beginning New York City teachers as the first step in identifying the characteristics and needs of persons making the transition to teaching.

Becoming a teacher means assuming a new role with new responsibilities. In an earlier study, Harrington & Sacks (1984) examined the stages of the transition from student to teacher. There is general consensus that novice teachers move through a series of phases from "anticipation" to "mastery" with greater or lesser ease (Evans, 1976; Lortie, 1976; Sacks & Harrington, 1982), yet there is still little discussion of specific interventions which might help the new teacher handle the experience in a productive way (Joyce & Showers, 1980). This

study examined the support structures that new teachers found helpful within the schools.

The purpose of this study was twofold: a descriptive profile of first year New York City public school teachers: their backgrounds, motivations for teaching, teaching skills and attitudes, personal attitudes, and experiences; and secondly, their perceptions of the supports they needed to survive as teachers. The final section describes one intervention, the Mentor Teacher Pilot Project.

Method

Subject

Participants were 602 first year NYC public school teachers of whom 470 (78%) were female, and 132 (22%) male. The average age was 33.6 years, with a mode of 25 and a range of 21 to 61 years. Representing the need for new teachers among the five NYC boroughs, the distribution was: Brooklyn, 42%; Bronx, 24%; Manhattan, 15%; Queens, 15%; Staten Island 4%. The sample was characterized as 38% Roman Catholic, 25% Jewish, 25% Protestant, and 12% self-described as "Other." In terms of racial group, the sample distribution was: 42% Caucasian, 27% Black, 20% Hispanic, 5% Native American, 4% Asian/Asian-American, and 3% self-described as "other." Taken together, the five minority groups actually comprised a majority (58%) of the participants.

Procedure

Data was obtained by a questionnaire administered by the researchers, with the support of the Division of Personnel of the NYC

Board of Education, in 48 "after school" workshops mandated for all new teachers. Data were collected during April 1983 from new teachers who had been employed since September.

Teachers at the workshops were simply instructed to fill out the questionnaires candidly as a task of the workshop. Although the questionnaires were anonymous, the teachers could hand in a separate mailing label if they wished to receive a summary of the results; 492 of the 602 did so. No renumeration was offered in exchange for participation.

The questionnaire consisted of 142 items, comprising six subscales: background information, motivations to teach, use of teaching skills and abilities, personal attitudes, personal experiences and support structures. All items except personal information were rated on Likert-type scales with responses ranging from one to five.

Data Source

Descriptive and inferential statistics were used to analyze the data. All tabulations and calculations were performed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). Data were analyzed by frequency distribution, mean and standard deviation, ANOVA, and t-tests. Eigenvalues are presented for several of the subscale analyses of factors.

Results and Discussion

Education, Training and Licensing

Nearly all (97%) of the teachers sampled had their Bachelor's

degree at the time of the questionnaire, while the remaining 3% were enrolled in a degree program. In addition, 41% of the entire sample had their Master's degree and another 33% were currently enrolled in a Master's program. One percent had a doctoral degree and 3% were enrolled in a Ph.D. or Ed.D. program. In all, the new teachers were highly educated.

Almost one half (49%) of the respondents had majored in Education, while 94% of the non-Education majors had a minor or concentration in Education. Of those 400 teachers with a graduate degree or currently enrolled in a degree program, 291 (73%) reported that their work was in Education. With respect to pre-service experience, more than three-fourths (79%) of the respondents said they had student taught, and 62% of those said they had assumed full responsibility for a class. In lieu of collegiate level teaching credentials, the Board of Education holds an Intensive Teacher Training Program over the summer. Only 7% of the respondent said they graduated from this program.

Of the beginning teachers sampled, 57% had regular NYC licenses, 37% said they were presently employed under temporary per diem certificates, 5% were appointed under the National Teacher Examination license procedure, and 2% were classified as "other." An examination of the 336 regular license holders found: 176 (29%) of the total sample with a license in Common Branches, 57 (10%) for J.H.S., 70 (12%) for H.S., 18 (3%) in Special Education and 15 (3%) held a Bilingual license. Thus, the group held a variety of teaching licenses and were distributed in every grade level with the highest proportion (31%) working in grades 7-9.

Class Size

The average class size reported was over 28 students, and the mode was 30. The few large gym classes with over 75 students were balanced by small Special Education classes. Class size, then, was generally large for beginning teachers. Statistical analysis to determine whether or not class size was related to stress or number of days absent due to illness or strain found no significant relationships.

Although large class size appears to be simply part of the job for beginning teachers, they did rate "decreasing class size" as a "very helpful" change in the classroom environment ($\bar{X}$ = 4.5, where 5 is highest rating of helpfulness on a 1-5 Lickert-type scale). In fact, decreasing class size was the most highly rated of all items in the support structure scale.

Past Experience

Some new teachers had prior teaching experiences; many had other careers. Although new teachers in the NYC school system, 175 (29%) had an average 2.33 years experience teaching in other school systems or settings. When asked if they were involved in other careers prior to teaching, 56% said they were and the average length at another type of work was found to be 3.66 years. Respondents reported having been involved in over 80 different types of jobs, ranging from an air traffic controller to the most frequently reported previous job--secretary.

This is a provocative finding. The image of the beginning teacher as a young education major fresh out of college is misleading. As the mean age of 33.57 years suggests and the 56% involved in other careers

confirms, beginning teachers in the NYC school system bring with them a wide range of experience and skills beyond a college education or student teaching experience. However, it is not clear whether these other work experiences help the new teacher in her or his first classroom or somehow make the new experience of teaching more difficult.

For example, experience as a day care center director obviously has similarities to teaching, particularly of younger children. Such work experience may sensitize the person to dealing with children, and help make the transition from learning how to teach young people to actually teaching young people easier. Experience in other jobs such as book-keeping may help the new teacher with necessary organizational skills, but might not necessarily aid in communicating with young people. Finally, jobs such as air traffic controller alert one to the possibility that at least some of these new teachers with various career backgrounds may be entering teaching because of job limitations elsewhere.

Effects of Training, Education and Past Experience

An Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) tested whether or not prior experience in another occupation, lack of student teaching experience or not having education as the major in one's undergraduate studies were related to reported stress. A composite of all the stress items was used throughout the study in accordance with Truch's instructions for scoring (1979, p. 234) and referred to as the Stress Scale. None of these experience variables made a significant contribution in explaining Stress using the ANOVA procedure.

The present sample of new teachers can be thought of as "survivors" of the first seven months of teaching. Future research contrasting "well adjusted survivors" to those who "drop out" should explore the impact of past work experience. Any negative effects the variables of earlier careers or lack of classroom experience may have on those who "drop out" were not assessed in this study. Other job experiences may set up expectations or desires in new teachers that are frustrated by the early realities of the classroom and the requirements of teaching.

Attitudes Toward Teaching

Most (77%) respondents were proud to be a teacher today and a majority (61%) said they would choose teaching again if they "had it to do over." Eighty-three percent of the sample said they were definitely returning to teaching in September 1984; only 1% gave a definitive "no" to this question and 16% answered "maybe." Whether those who were not so proud and/or would choose another profession if they "had it to do over" were returning to teaching because they felt they had no other options or because they thought it might improve as they got more experience is not known.

Scale Derivation

Motivations to Teach. From a list of 21 possible motivations for going into teaching, rated on 5-point bipolar scales (1 = not important to 5 = highly important), "desire to contribute to children's education" ($\bar{X}$ = 4.3), "love of school and learning" ($\bar{X}$ = 4.1) and "service to young people" ($\bar{X}$ = 4.0) were rated as the most important. Using the eigenvalues and considering the interpretability of various factors

under the possible solutions using the Varimax Factor Analysis procedure, it was found that the motivation items comprised three factors: Idealism, Material Benefits, and Encouragement from Others. Three scales were then constructed using the appropriate items (see Table 1).

Insert Table 1 about here

Autonomy. Fifteen items entitled "personal attitudes" were included to assess personal autonomy.[3] Respondents were asked to indicate the extent to which they agreed or disagreed with statements such as "I can feel right without having to please others" and "In life an individual should for the most part make his or her own decisions attempting to resist being influenced by others" on 5-point bipolar scales (1 = strongly agree to 5 = strongly disagree). Two factors with acceptable internal consistency, Autonomy and Social Approval, were retained using 11 of the items (see Table 1).

Stress. As noted above, the Stress scale was a composite of all 32 items, in accordance with Truch's instructions for scoring (1979, p. 234). In addition to the overall Stress score, the items were subgrouped into eight areas in a teacher's experience which may or may not cause concern and stress for the individual. These eight areas are: a) class/students b) administrators c) fellow teachers d) parents e) workload f) demands g) physical symptoms h) psychological symptoms.

Scale Analyses

Stress, Autonomy and Social Approval. It was hypothesized that those teachers who were characterized as the most autonomous (based on low scores) would report the least amount of stress symtoms in their first year of teaching, while those who were the least autonomous would experience the most stress. As Table 2 indicates, there was no support for this; indeed the weak correlation between stress and autonomy was positive ($r = .08$, $p < .05$). In addition, an ANOVA of stress yielded no significant effects for Autonomy or Idealism. Perhaps new teachers who feel autonomous in their own decision making feel also "freer" to report stress symptoms. Since stress seems to be ultimately related to teacher drop-out (Sakharov & Farber, 1983), early self-reported stress must be an indicator which professionals concerned with retention should focus on.

Insert Table 2 about here

The Social Approval scale (containing items reflecting lack of personal autonomy) did, however, correlate with the stress measure as Table 2 indicates, thus indirectly supporting the original hypothesis ($r = .21$, $p < .01$). Although the fifteen items taken from the Personal Attitudes scale were all believed a priori to measure autonomy, the data on Table 2 indicate that the two scales are measuring distinct concepts that are statistically unrelated. If Social Approval was simply the opposite of autonomy there should be a large negative correlation between the two. We see instead no relationship ($r = .02$).

The significant correlation in Table 2 between the "Encouragement from Others" motivation scale and the Social Approval scale bolsters the validity of the latter ($r = .16$, $p < .01$). Those persons with a higher need for social approval are likely to enter teaching because others encourage and approve of that choice. Such persons, however, might not themselves have chosen teaching although they believe they may gain social approval for their choice. However, when faced with the realities of the classroom, they may find the experience not what they really wanted or had anticipated. Their initial focus when making the decision to teach may have been on themselves and their need for approval and acceptance, rather than on what the actual day-to-day activities of a teacher might be. The real experience, then, is rather stressful.

Stress and Motivations to Teach. The three motivation scales were significantly correlated with one another as Table 2 indiactes. Apparently respondents were motivated to go into teaching for a variety of reasons, and these were not mutually exclusive. The correlation between Material Benefits and Encouragement ($r = .31$, $p < .01$) was stronger than the correlations of both of these two factors with the Idealism factor ($r = .12$ and $r = .13$ respectively, $p < .01$ for both). Was it not naive to expect people to choose teaching for idealist reasons?

The Idealism scale did correlate significantly with Stress

($r = -.08$, $p < .05$) as Table 2 demonstrates. This indicates that those who were most highly motivated to teach for reasons such as "love of teaching" and "to help young people" were the ones most likely to experience stress. When expectations fail to be supported by some evidence of success, teachers' frustration is heightened (Brophy, 1982; Good, 1982; Sakharov & Farber, 1983).

Differences in Stress Among Subgroups

In considering the findings of psychologists that any life changes, including a new job, can be stressful enough to trigger physical illness (Rahe, 1974), it was expected that the new teachers would report moderate to high levels of stress. However, the actual amounts of stress, physical symptoms, tension, and frustration reported were relatively low. The means for the total Stress scale and the eight subscales for the full sample and for subsamples of teachers grouped according to grades taught can be found in Table 3.

Insert Table 3 about here

The study was conducted in the spring of the first year of teaching; those included in the sample, therefore, can be considered "survivors" as noted above, and the relatively low levels of stress reported must be viewed with this fact in mind. We do not have a sample of those who left in their first semester of teaching with measurements on all the variables.

It is not known whether a particular subgroup of persons classifiable along a general demographic variable is most at risk of experiencing a difficult time and subsequently dropping out, whether there are individual differences such as personality variables (e.g. autonomy) which contribute to this situation, or whether the particular school climate is the decisive factor. Most likely it is a result of the person-environment interaction (Berliner, 1983; Edmonds, 1981; Mackenzie, 1983).

Despite such a "survivor" limitation in these data, it seemed worthwhile to check for any differences in stress levels for particular subgroups. In general, there were no significant differences in reported stress levels between men and women, old and young beginning teachers, and teachers of different grade levels taught. Kindergarten through 3rd grade teachers reported the largest amount of stress ($\bar{X}$ = 2.68 of a possible 5) while taking the fewest days off. It was expected that junior high teachers, dealing with pupils at that difficult age of puberty, would experience a good deal of stress, but their mean score ($\bar{X}$ = 2.56) is actually the lowest reported on Table 3.

A small sample (n = 8) of persons who quit their first year teaching job in NYC public schools within the first few months was made available to the authors.[4] These short questionnaires, inquiring into the difficulties experienced by those who quit, are useful only as a possible glimpse at the missing piece of the total sample of all those teachers who began their first year of teaching in NYC public schools in Fall 1982. Indeed it is not known how representative this glimpse is of all those who dropped out in that beginning semester.

The reports are in sharp contrast to the positive picture from the present study. One 9th grade English teacher wrote of "total exhaustion to the point of illness because of work load and frustration." A junior high math teacher wrote, "My experience--one term--at a high school was so devastating that just thinking about teaching makes me literally sick." All cited the need for help with "discipline problems," "red tape," "motivating pupils," and "curriculum."

It is interesting to note that five of the eight respondents to the "Exit Questionnaire" taught at the junior high level. It may well be that teachers in grades 7-9, as originally expected, do indeed experience the most stress, but those with the highest levels of stress have already dropped out by the spring semester. The present sample, then, may erroneously suggest there are no meaningful differences among teachers of different age levels, when perhaps a particular group may be at greater risk of stress and thus drop out. Further research is necessary to understand what is needed to prevent beginning teacher drop-out; the poignant responses of those who resign early is compelling, but scant, data.

Among other subgroups, Caucasians reported the highest stress ($\bar{X}$ = 2.7), Native Americans, Asian Americans, and Hispanics ($\bar{X}$ = 2.6), were grouped together, and Blacks reported the least stress ($\bar{X}$ = 2.56). The only significant difference was between Caucasians and Blacks ($t_{(290)} = 2.15$, $p < .05$). Overall, the new teachers report a relatively low level of stress. This is interesting especially when contrasted to how the respondents tended to describe their work demands. They

reported they often "take work home to complete it," "have too much to do and not enough time to do it," and impose "self-demands in order to meet scheduled deadlines." These new teachers report working hard and not being too stressed by it.

Teaching Skills and Abilities

In response to the 19 item list of skills and abilities, the teachers described "frequently using" almost all of the positive techniques.[5] This would be anticipated in self-reporting. The two least frequently cited skills were "recognizing sex stereotypes in instructional methods and materials" and "use of specific techniques for developing intergroup and cross-cultural understandings." Over three-fourths of the teachers are women and over one half represent minority groups. With this in mind, it is possible that staff training and curriculum awareness discussions may be fruitful interventions to focus on sexual, racial, and ethnic stereotyping and to help develop intergroup skills.

Support Structures and Mentor Teachers

Responses to items concerning work relationships reflect a supportive environment and teachers most often rated others as "very helpful." Teachers greatest concerns were 1) the child's home environment, 2) apparent parent disinterest, and 3) lack of student motivation. These concerns relate to the earlier cited motivations to teach: "desire to contribute to children's education." Assisting new teachers to deal with their concerns about the children and their motivations and involvements seems to be a specific area for staff

discussion since teachers' initial expectations for satisfaction will be thwarted without some sense of student success (Good, 1982, 1983).

Finally, eighty-one percent of the first year teachers indicated that they would have liked to have had a mentor, a newly retired NYC teacher, during the early transition to teaching. Mentor help was requested for moral support, guidance and feedback (cited by 145 teachers), for consultation on discipline and management concerns (119), for assistance with curriculum and lesson planning (110), help with school routines and scheduling (63), motivational techniques (36), and aid in evaluating and individualizing instruction (12). Sixteen new teachers wrote that mentors would not be helpful and felt they might be "too rigid."

Summary

In general, then, the first year teachers in this study seemed to share similar attitudes and motivations and express similar needs in their new jobs regardless of gender, racial or religious differences, or grade levels taught. School administrators and fellow teachers were characterized as supportive and the children themselves were the focus of concern for the beginning teachers. Despite high work loads and demands, absenteeism and physical and psychological stress symptoms were low, and most of the respondents were proud to be teachers and planned to return to teaching. The fact that there were so few differences among the 602 teachers from diverse backgrounds and experiences, from every grade level and city borough suggests that the first teaching year may have a "normalizing" effect.

The picture one gets of the first year teacher, then, is one of a hard-working individual who is motivated more by idealistic than pragmatic reasons for entering teaching. This individual has been able to "fit in" well enough with the existing social system, taking her or his place among the other teachers and administrators in the school without excessive stress. This beginning teacher seems to be more concerned with her or his students and their experience than with her or his own experience as a new teacher, and this is an indication of the transition from self-preoccupation to pupil-centeredness necessary for effective teaching (Harrington & Sacks, 1984).

This picture of the beginning teacher must be tempered by the fact that it is based on self-report. We asked the new teacher to describe her or his own motivations, experiences and attitudes, and therefore must accept the subjective bias in this method. On the other hand, the self-reports on the "Exit Questionnaire" were candid and frank, and there is little reason to suspect the "survivors" as being less open or candid.

Mentor Teacher Pilot Project

On the basis of new teacher interest in the mentor concept and the increasing need for new staff in New York City, the Bureau of Staff Development of the Board of Education secured funding for a Mentor Teacher Pilot Project to be conducted in collaboration with two members of the Barnard College Education faculty. The Mentor Project was initiated as an early intervention strategy to support and guide new

teachers in 1984-85. During the summer of 1984, 17 retired teachers from elementary and junior high schools were recommended by their former school districts as mentors for the pilot project. The project began in September 1984 with 16 mentors assigned to 43 new teachers in 15 elementary and junior high schools. "Mentoring" was scheduled throughout the full academic year.

To prepare for the role of mentor, the retired teachers participated in a two-week summer workshop aimed at helping them to understand new teachers' needs and how best to help them. The workshops concluded with participants in agreement that the mentor role was to develop strategies for supporting beginning teachers:

- to develop their own teaching styles and confidence
- to become decision makers in their classrooms
- to understand children's cognitive and affective needs
- to become sensitive to different learning styles
- to broaden and deepen their repertoire of learning activities and effective ways of teaching and coping with the first year.

"To Motivate, not Dominate" became the Mentor-Teacher slogan!

The workshops focused on helping the mentors, with their wealth of experience, to understand the perspectives and sensitivities of new teachers. Discussions and role play were designed to examine power issues, control ("We have to be careful not to usurp the new teacher's authority in the classroom"), flexibility, and self-confidence in mentor-teacher relationships and in teacher-student relationships.

The project is presently in action following a schedule of intensive 12 hours of mentoring in September, February and March and six hours during the other months of the school year. So far, all mentors who began in September are still involved. All principals are enthusiastic. All new teachers are still teaching in the assigned schools and seem to have accepted the mentors' participation. The project is being evaluated by site visits, observations, logs, questonnaires, and interviews with both mentors and new teachers.

What is of interest now is the content of the mentoring relationship: whether or not new teachers are becoming more effective because of it; and whether or not mentors have the patience as the novices make the transitions from entry level teaching through the trial and error period to a time of integration and consolidation of teaching skills. Retention of new teachers was one goal, but support and skill improvement was another, along with employment of retirees. The potential for this intervention is just unfolding and time is needed to assess its impact.

Table 1

Alpha Coefficients for Autonomy, Social Approval and Three Motivation Scales

Scale	Number of items	Alpha
Autonomy	5	.54
Social Approval	6	.71
Idealism	6	.81
Material Benefits	6	.77
Encouragement	2	.71

Table 2

Correlations Among the Six Scales

	Stress	Idealism	Material Benefits	Encouragement	Social Approval
Idealism	-.08*				
Material Benefits	.00	.12**			
Encouragement	-.01	.13**	.31**		
Social Approval	.21**	.02	.10*	.16**	
Autonomy	.08*	-.05	.00	.05	.02

*p< .05

**p< .01

Table 3

Demographic Description, Means on Stress Scale, and Days Ill for Total Sample and Subgroups by Grades

	Subgroups by Grades Taught[a] k-3 (n=218)	4-6 (n=199)	7-9 (n=273)	10-12 (n=128)	Total All grades (N=602)[b]
Sex					
Female	91.3 %	86.4 %	67.8 %	60.2 %	78 %
Male	8.3	13.1	31.1	39.8	22
Race					
Caucasian	33.5 %	34.2 %	42.5 %	41.4 %	42 %
Black	29.8	23.1	19.4	21.9	27
Hispanic	18.3	21.6	17.2	8.6	20
Other	10.6	13.6	8.4	13.3	11
Age					
30 or under	45.4 %	45.2 %	39.6 %	44.5 %	44 %
Over 30	50.5	50.3	53.1	49.2	50
Days Ill					
More than 3	39.7 %	45.2 %	45.1 %	42.9 %	43 %
3 or less	60.1	54.3	53.8	54.5	53
Total Stress (32 items)	$\bar{X}$ 2.68	$\bar{X}$ 2.60	$\bar{X}$ 2.56	$\bar{X}$ 2.60	$\bar{X}$ 2.63
Stress SubScales (4 items each)					
Class/Students	3.04	3.01	3.00	2.90	2.99
Administrators	1.74	1.76	1.70	1.82	1.75
Fellow Teachers	1.74	1.70	1.62	1.61	1.67
Parents	3.24	3.14	3.00	2.87	3.06
Work Load	3.14	3.32	3.22	3.30	3.31
Demands	2.81	2.66	2.74	2.79	2.75
Phys. Symptoms	2.84	2.76	2.69	2.61	2.72
Psych. Symptoms	2.65	2.68	2.56	2.47	2.59

Note: Missing cases in each category account for percentages not totalling 100 percent.
[a] Summing across four subsamples by grade level equals 818 due to overlap in grades taught.

Notes

1 This research was supported by a grant from Barnard College, Columbia University, and was conducted with the cooperation of Drs. Bernadette Pepin and Nicholas Aiello of the New York City Board of Education Division of Personnel.

2 Study conducted by the New York City Board of Education Division of Personnel, Bureau of Staff Development and Training. B. Pepin, personal communication, February 1983.

3 Autonomy items from scale in paper, "Conceptualization and Measurement of Autonomy," author unknown. Reviewed for Sociology and Social Research Quarterly. Fall 1979. The scale was found to have construct validity of $r = .38$, $p < .001$ and a reliability coefficient of .81 (Cronbach's Coefficient Alpha).

4 Exit Questionnaires administered by the Bureau of Staff Development and Training and made available to S.R. Sacks.

5 Nineteen teaching skills and attitudes items from First Year Teacher Survey, Pennsylvania Department of Education, Harrisburg, PA.

References

Berliner, D.C. (Ed.). (1983). Research on teaching [Special issue]. Educational Psychologist, 18 (3).

Brophy, J. (March 1982). Classroom management and learning. American Education, 20-23.

Edmonds, R.R. (1981). Making public schools effective. Social Policy, 12 (2), 56-60.

Evans, E.D. (1976). Transition to teaching. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Good, T.L. (December 1982). How teachers' expectations affect results. American Education, 25-32.

Good, T.L. (1983). Classroom research: A decade of progress. Educational Psychologist, 18 (3), 127-144.

Goodlad, J.I. (March 1983). A study of schooling: Some findings and hypotheses. Phi Delta Kappan, 465-470.

Harrington, G.N. & Sacks, S.R. (May 1984). Student to teacher: novel strategies for achieving the transition. Journal of Education for Teaching, 154-163.

Joyce, B. & Showers, B. (Feb. 1980). Improving inservice training: The messages of research. Educational Leadership, 379-385.

Lortie, D.C. (1975). Schoolteacher. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Mackenzie, D.E. (1983). Research for school improvement: An appraisal of some recent trends. Educational Researcher, 12 (4), 5-17.

McDonald, F.J. (1976). Beginning teacher evaluation study, Phase II. Princeton: Educational Testing Services.

Rahe, R.H. (1974). The pathways between subject's recent life changes and their near-future illness reports: Presentation results and methodological issues. In B.S. Bohrenwend and B.P. Bohrenwend (Eds.), Stressful life events: Their nature and effects. New York: Wiley.

Sacks, S.R., & Harrington, G.N. (1982). Student to teacher: The process of role transition. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York City, N.Y.

Sakharov, M. & Farber, B.A. (1983). A critical study of burnout in teachers. In B.A. Farber (Ed.), Stress and burnout in the human service professions (pp. 65-81). New York: Pergamon Press.

Sizer, T.R. (June 1983). High school reform: The need for engineering. Phi Delta Kappan, 679-683.

Sykes, G. (1983). Contradictions, ironies, and promises unfulfilled: A contemporary account of the status of teaching. Phi Delta Kappan, 65 (2), 87-93.

Truch, S. (1979). Teacher burnout and what to do about it. Novato, Ca.: Academic Therapy Publications.